

Journal
of the
Child Welfare League
of America
Inc.

child welfare

June 1956

So Much for So Little

Commentary on

"Must Caseworkers Do
Everything?"

How to Interpret a

Foster Home Program
in a Small Community

Commentary on

"Administrative Reorganiza-
tion of Child Welfare"

Administrative Supervision

CHILD WELFARE JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

CHILD WELFARE is a forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CONTENTS

	Page
So Much for So Little	1
By Sara R. Caldwell	
Commentary on "Must Caseworkers Do Everything?"	7
By Mary E. Burns	
On Therapy	11
By Selma Fraiberg	
How to Interpret a Foster Home Program in a Small Community	13
By Joann F. Davies	
Commentary on "Administrative Reorganization of Child Welfare"	18
By Helen C. Hubbell	
Administrative Supervision	22
By Frances D. Bellanca	
News from the Field	27
Book Notes	27
Classified Personnel Openings	28

Editorial and general office: 345 East 46th Street, N. Y. 17, N. Y. Published monthly except August and September by the Child Welfare League of America, Inc. Annual Subscription, \$3.00; Single Copies, 35 cents.

VOL. XXXV

No. 6

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Officers

MARSHALL FIELD, *President*, New York
MRS. HERBERT E. FISHER, *Vice-Pres.*, Hartford, Conn.
MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER, *Vice-Pres.*, Marshall, Va.
MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER, *Vice-Pres.*, New York
MRS. GEORGE L. WEST, *Vice-Pres.*, Pittsburgh, Pa.
MRS. RAY W. WILTOUGHBY, *Vice-Pres.*, San Angelo, Texas
MISS LOIS WILBY, *Secretary*, Chicago, Ill.
THOMAS M. PETERS, *Treasurer*, New York
JOSEPH H. REID, *Executive Dir.*
HELEN R. HAGAN, *Asst. Exec. Dir.*

Board of Directors

DR. LEONA BAUMGARTNER, New York, N. Y.
FRANK S. BANTLY, JR., Seattle, Wash.
MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD, New York, N. Y.
JUDGE JANE M. BOLIN, New York, N. Y.
JAMES BROWN, IV, Chicago, Ill.
MRS. ROBERT A. BROWN, Des Moines, Iowa
MRS. SARA R. CALDWELL, Jackson, Miss.
MRS. CLARENCE A. CHICHESTER, Piedmont, Cal.
DR. ALISON DAVIS, Chicago, Ill.
MRS. IRVING EDISON, St. Louis, Mo.
JUDGE GEORGE EDWARDS, Detroit, Mich.
DR. MARTHA M. ELLIOT, Washington, D. C.
ALAN S. GELSMER, Cleveland, Ohio
CLYDE GUTZ, Los Angeles, Cal.
AUSTIN T. GRAVES, New York, N. Y.
JOSEPH F. HAYS, Atlanta, Ga.
SHELFY M. HARRISON, New York, N. Y.
MRS. KATE B. HILMS, Columbia, S. C.
LESLIE L. JACOBS, Dallas, Texas
JUDGE HARRY W. LINDEMAN, Newark, N. J.
LEONARD W. MAYO, New York, N. Y.
ROBERT M. MCLFORD, Boston, Mass.
GEORGE M. NAYTOR, Boston, Mass.
JACK N. PRITZKER, Chicago, Ill.
DR. JULIUS B. RICHMOND, Syracuse, N. Y.
JULIUS F. ROTHMAN, New York, N. Y.
WILLIAM D. SCHMIDT, Cleveland, Ohio
MRS. J. FRAZER SMITH, Memphis, Tenn.
DR. TELMAN M. SOGGE, Northfield, Minn.
REV. JOSEPH P. SPRINGOR, Milwaukee, Wis.
JOHN G. THILMAN, Washington, D. C.
MRS. JUAN T. TRUPE, New York, N. Y.
C. ROLLIN ZANE, Hartford, Conn.

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

E. MARGUERITE GANE, *Chairman*
Executive Director, Children's Aid and S.P.C.C., Buffalo, N. Y.

Policy Committee

MRS. CHARLES S. MONROE
MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER
MR. C. ROLLIN ZANE

Advisory Committee

MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE
Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
THELMA K. FLOWER
Executive Director, Family Services Society, Akron, Ohio
ADELAIDE KAISER
Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.
FRIEDA M. KUHLMANN
Executive Secretary
First Family Day Care Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
LUCILLE LAZAR
Personnel Director
Jewish Child Care Association, New York, N. Y.
LUCILE LEWIS
Day Care Consultant
State Department of Welfare, Nashville, Tenn.
ELIZABETH G. MEIER
Associate Professor
New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.
ROBERT F. OTT
Director, Division of Child Guardianship, State Department of Welfare, Boston, Mass.
IRVING RIMER
Executive Director, National Publicity Council, New York, N. Y.
SUSANNE SCHULZE
Associate Professor, School of Social Service Administration
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
VERNE WEED
Assistant Executive Director
Children's Services of Conn., Hartford, Conn.
RUTH WEISENBARGER
Assistant Director
Sheltering Arms Childrens Service, New York, N. Y.

SO MUCH FOR SO LITTLE

Sara R. Caldwell

Chief of Social Services
State Department of Public Welfare
Jackson, Mississippi

This report of the use which states have made of federal funds is based upon the writer's own experience, reports from the files of the Child Welfare League, and published and unpublished reports of the U.S. Children's Bureau.

A LOOK at what has happened in the last twenty years to children who are "homeless, dependent, neglected, and children in danger of becoming delinquent"¹ disproves many long-held beliefs about federal, state, and local relationships. It also brings to light some new, and to some persons, surprising facts. There seems to be a need to point up some of these, substituting fact for fancy, in order that we may continue to "extend and strengthen" public welfare services for children.

Among the facts to emerge are:

1. Within the framework of the Social Security Act the states are allowed a considerable degree of freedom in using federal child welfare services funds to meet the needs of the individual state.
2. The stimulus of federal funds and the further identification of the needs of children has resulted in an amazing increase in the state and local funds available for child welfare programs.
3. The limitation on the use of federal funds in urban areas for projects related to community organization is a handicap to the states wishing to develop a comprehensive program of services to children wherever they may live.
4. Fewer services are available at the present time for children in cities and urban communities than for children in rural areas.

These facts are substantiated by a review of what has actually happened since the passage of the Social Security Act.

First, let us look at where we were in 1936 before the Social Security Act with its provisions for "Child Welfare Services" came into being. Few states had statewide public programs for the care and protection of children. Fewer had identifiable programs for children. Those that did, by and large, had some type of "mother's aid" or a "ward of the state" program which was a far cry from an organized service program to children in

their own homes. Too often those services in existence were for special groups of children—children of veterans, children adjudged delinquent, or children declared by the courts in need of care. There were also child welfare programs under private auspices but here again they were limited to certain groups of children, depending frequently upon the religious denomination of the family and where they happened to live. Most of these agencies provided institutional care for the children they accepted, but were able to offer very little in the area of preventive casework or services to children living with their families. This takes on new significance when one remembers what it meant to the individual child who needed service.

In 1936—Too Little

What could the neglected child expect? What happened to the child with behavior problems? Who found the crippled child, the child with hearing or visual difficulties? Who tried to understand rather than punish the delinquent? Who cared for the child abandoned by his parents? What was in store for the unmarried mother? What protection was there for her baby?

Except in a few states with public child welfare programs and in a relatively few widely scattered locations where there were well established private agencies, such children had a hard time. They were dealt with by well-meaning neighbors, local public officials, kindhearted citizens, courts accustomed to handling adult criminals, or were left to grow up as best they could. We can be thankful for the child-caring institutions, the child-placing agencies, the interested citizens and for what they did for the children they could reach. At the same time, we must remember the great numbers of children needing similar care who did not live in the right spot or did not come in contact with those who could help them.

¹ Social Security Act, Title V, Part 3.

The neglected child could expect separation from his family, usually "for keeps" and placement in an institution, wage home, free home, or possibly in an adoptive home. Whatever the final disposition, the procedure seldom included the help to the child and his family and the preparation for placement which we now think is essential. The child with behavior problems was often grouped with the delinquent child and "sentenced" to a term in an institution for delinquent children. The act was considered rather than the cause, and the punishment meted out accordingly. The unmarried mother had the benefit of placement in a maternity home, if she was lucky enough to live in the right place and to fit the usually rigid admission policies of the home. She released her baby for adoption. Again, the element most usually absent was the caseworker with the recognition of the cause behind the mother's problem and with the skill and knowledge to help her.

When federal child welfare services funds came into being, the picture began to change. That was the beginning, on a national basis, of the recognition that all parents are not "good parents" and that a child should not be deprived of all chances to an adequate life because of inadequate parental or family background. It was the beginning of acceptance on the part of the public that, to discover and solve the problems of children in distress, special workers trained in child welfare were needed. It was a recognition that communities needed leadership in knowing how best to develop resources and services for children.

The States Chart Their Own Course

In those days, following the depression, any money was welcomed by the states. Those states already having a statewide program for children used federal funds for "extending and strengthening" their existing programs. Those states having no program set to work to pass legislation which would enable them to establish one. A legislative framework had to be set up and a plan

worked out with the United States Children's Bureau for the use of the federal child welfare services funds.

The first fact to emerge, as opposed to the fancy still held by some people, was that the states and territories were allowed, even encouraged, to use the federal funds in those ways most appropriate to meet their needs. Within the framework of the Federal Act there was little that was bureaucratic or stereotyped in the way the programs developed. Each state started where it was and, with the help of private agencies and citizens' groups, determined what should be done. In some states the money was used to add special staff or establish a new service. In others the funds were used for surveys of the needs of children or for the establishment of demonstration units. Many states used a part of the funds for educational leave grants in order to secure staff equipped to work with children. A review of the annual and biennial reports shows that ingenuity and imagination were the order of the day.

The inspiring thing to those who cared, was that in each state and territory, there sprang into being a small corps of child welfare workers dedicated to searching out the children needing care and protection, and committed to helping them. The children were easy to find. They were there in the schools, on the streets, in towns and in the country. Some communities seemed to sigh with relief when they realized that the "Child Welfare Worker" could and would help. It is even more heartening to think of what it meant to the children themselves—"My worker understands."

Having found the children, the next step was to search for resources to meet their needs. This was a harder and proved to be a never ending quest—more money, more foster homes, better medical care, diagnostic and treatment centers. How can we know more about Johnny? How can we get at the seat of his problem? How can we help him? Fortunately, all the while more and more staff was being added, more and more resources were being developed or expanded, and more and more children were receiving

individual attention by workers trained to help them and their families.

The pattern of flexibility begun in the early days continues today. Reports from the states show that within the limitations of the Social Security Act the states are continuing to use federal funds to take care of unmet needs. They are being used for the experimental project, the new services.

States' Responses to Stimulation

Those same reports also point up another fact. Federal funds have encouraged the states and communities to produce state and local funds to take over the services that have been proven to be worthwhile. This has resulted in a rapid expansion of services in many communities, and has also freed federal funds for additional demonstration and experimental projects.

The extent to which the states have responded to the needs of children is amazing. For instance, a state which had no state funds in 1936 reported spending \$241,090 in 1955. Another moved from no funds in 1936 to \$243,823 in local funds and \$210,926 in state funds. In still another, starting from scratch, \$367,121 of state funds and \$77,939 of local funds were spent for the same period. This last was one of the poorest of the states, and one wonders when the state would have assumed this responsibility had it not been for the impetus of federal funds. These are cited because they are typical and not because they are the exception.

A report made by 42 of the 48 states to the Children's Bureau in 1954 revealed that the national picture as of that time was as impressive as that in the states cited above. Of the \$35,000,000 spent for administration of child welfare in 1954, \$6,600,000 were federal funds, \$20,700,000 state funds, and \$7,700,000 local funds. In the costs of foster care the amount expended by the state and local governments shows up even more. Of the \$91,000,000 spent for foster care in 1954, \$300,000 were federal funds, \$29,800,000 state funds, and \$60,900,000 local funds. This demonstrates an acceptance on the part of state and local communities of their basic

responsibility to carry the bulk of the cost for caring for their children.

Those states which had funds before 1936 have reported ways in which federal funds have given more flexibility in program development. One western state reports:

"In a number of counties a specialized child welfare program has been started with reimbursement for professional staff salaries paid from Federal child welfare services funds. As the value of these services has been recognized by the community, the county has taken over a greater percentage of the cost of personnel and added additional personnel paid entirely from local funds. . . . An increase in State funds has been necessary as county welfare departments have moved into giving adoption service after the basic child welfare program has been established through the use of child welfare services funds."

Other specific examples from another state are:

"Federal child welfare services funds were originally used in setting up subsidized foster care program(s) for children needing special help. The value of the service was clearly demonstrated so that the agency now has six such homes with state funds paying the entire cost. Federal funds were also originally used to develop the program of protective service for children. The state now pays 50% of the salaries of the workers in protective service."

A report on a New England state having a long history of child welfare services reads,

"Although the ratio of Federal child welfare services funds to State and local public funds available for the child welfare program has been small indeed (\$100,000 to \$5,000,000), the State agency, through the use of Federal child welfare services funds, has been able to establish, extend, and strengthen the program in ways that were not possible through the use of State funds. The State agency adoption program was initiated with Federal child welfare services funds several years ago. Subsequently, the Public Welfare Commissioner was able to secure State funds to pay the salary and travel costs of the adoption workers. Federal child welfare services funds are still used to pay for the cost of two supervisors. The Administrative Review program, as well as the child welfare research and statistics program, were also established with Federal child welfare services funds."

One other example points up one of the major factors in the advantage of federal funds.

"On the State level there has been a steady increase in State funds for the administration of child welfare

services. Over the past six years the amount of State funds for child welfare services has increased from \$194,694 to \$207,938 for the year 1955-56. . . . The additional State funds were given to take over activities established through use of Federal funds . . . it was much easier to secure funds for an on-going activity than for a new service, the value of which has not been proven."

And so it goes throughout the length and breadth of the land. The dollars and cents are impressive. The additional staff and services are wonderful to behold, but again, the important thing is that children are being served—and in their own localities. No longer is it necessary to rely entirely on institutions serving a whole state to care for children who must be removed from their parents. We have foster homes, homemakers, day care centers. No longer are children in distress dependent almost entirely on the kindness of the neighbors. We have 4,000 child welfare workers in 1,656 of the 3,137 counties in the United States giving full-time services to children.

The Tables Have Turned

One fact, which was true when the Social Security Act was passed, is no longer a fact, but has become a fancy. Before the child welfare services funds implemented the expansion of services, there were more resources available to children in the urban areas. For the most part, the institutions for children were located in the cities. The voluntary agencies giving services to children were in the larger communities. Many cities, recognizing the need for protective services for children and faced with the need to provide facilities, had public funds available and were operating a child welfare program.

The children living in the rural areas of the nation did not have the benefit of these programs. The rural communities had fewer financial resources. It is well that the groups initiating the original legislation took this into account in their planning. It is fortunate that Congress went along with this thinking and that the law placed special emphasis on areas "predominantly rural."

In the twenty years that have passed however, as the child welfare picture has changed,

so has the need. The present limitation in the Social Security Act provides that the funds shall be "expended for payment of part of the cost of district, county, or other local child welfare services in areas predominantly rural and for developing state services for the encouragement and assistance of adequate methods of community child welfare organization in areas predominantly rural and other areas of special need."² The definitions³ of urban and rural have been broadened as much as possible but still present real restrictions on the use of federal funds. For example, some states predominantly rural may have a number of counties which have to be classified as urban because the majority of the population lives in a town.

Even more serious is the limitation in the language of the Act which permits states to use federal funds in urban areas *only* for developing state services to encourage and assist with methods of community child welfare organization. This virtually shuts off the use of federal funds, for basic program development, to any area falling within the definition of urban. Sometimes in urban areas, as in rural, the primary need is for the establishment of a service. Federal funds may be needed for this as well as for community child welfare organization.

² *Ibid.*

³ "A predominantly rural area for which Federal funds are expended shall be a geographical area including a county or more, or less than a county that comprises a unit for the provision of services, in which more than 50 percent of the population live in non-urban places as defined by the Bureau of the Census¹ or in which less than 50 percent of the population live in non-urban places but which has no city of 10,000 or more population according to the census.

¹ The Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Population: 1950 Vol. I, Number of Inhabitants, gives the new definition of urban as including the following:

- (a) places of 2,500 inhabitants or more incorporated as cities, boroughs, towns and villages.
- (b) the densely settled urban fringe, including both incorporated and unincorporated areas around cities of 50,000 or more and
- (c) unincorporated places of 2,500 inhabitants or more outside any urban fringe.

All other areas are classified as rural."

Handbook for Child Welfare Services, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Children's Bureau, April 11, 1955.

Many st
Act as far
projects re
in urban a
of special
when wh
welfare se
or expans
funds are
administr
around l
cumberso
concern v
cern of g
them.

Needs Act

Many
not hav
those p
public v
program
wide ba
woefull
presum

Agai
reports

"Th
as thos

"In
urban,
ices to
and c
there
erally
much

"T

same
feder
devel
disting

Fu
state
ing a
foun

4 N
perm

CHI

Many states have attempted to stretch the Act as far as possible by setting up specialized projects relating to community organization in urban areas and designating them as areas of special need. This is a poor substitute when what may be needed is the use of child welfare services funds for the development or expansion of a continuing service. When funds are used in "areas of special need" administrative and fiscal problems arise around budgeting and reporting. This is cumbersome but it seems to be but a minor concern when contrasted to the major concern of getting services to children who need them.

Needs in Urban Areas Have Become Acute

Many so-called "urban" communities do not have resources for children other than those provided through the department of public welfare; and, as more comprehensive programs have been developed on a statewide basis, the communities have emerged as woefully lacking in resources they have been presumed to have.

Again the states speak through their reports:

"The needs in the urban areas are as acute as those in the rural areas."

"In many counties in (State)⁴ classified as urban, the only agencies offering social services to children are the probation department and county welfare department. In others, there may be a few small agencies, but generally they serve only a city or town leaving much of the county uncovered."

"The need of a child for services is the same wherever he lives, and the need for federal funds to stimulate and encourage the development of services does not know any distinction as to urban and rural areas."

Further detailed information from the states points up that some of the more pressing and serious child welfare problems are found in the larger communities.

"In our urban areas the needs are more intensified than in rural areas. Inadequate incomes, low moral standards, alcoholism, emotional immaturity, overcrowded living conditions with all the problems resulting from such close living; lack of play space, many children cooped up in apartments with no outdoor play space available; mothers working leaving children with no care or improper care, are some of the characteristic problems in our cities."

"Commercial facilities for child care are springing up with no means of control since this state has no licensing law. These are more prevalent in urban areas."

"The juvenile delinquency rate is higher in urban areas. Most children's courts do not have social service or probation staff, thus turn to the department of public welfare for this service."

"Family counseling which often saves homes for children is not available other than through the department of public welfare except in four areas in the state, and this to a very limited degree."

"Crime among adults and neglect of children is more prevalent in urban areas. Inadequate parents often tend to drift toward the city and children's needs become greater than in some rural areas where a more neighborly spirit of helpfulness exists. Independent placement of children is a problem, and large numbers of unmarried expectant mothers come to the city to seek protection for themselves and the baby. More problems of a protective nature occur such as abandonment, abuse, etc. Tensions run higher; the stress of life is greater, thus affecting the emotional development of children. These call for skilled workers to deal with the parents and children involved and state and local governments are unable to provide adequate staff."

Many states report that there are no voluntary agencies giving care for children in the so-called "urban" areas. Others report that where there are private agencies they are requesting that the state assist in developing a more comprehensive program to meet the needs of all children.

⁴ No localities are identified because time did not permit writing to obtain permission to identify the state.

Statistics bear this out. The table below, compiled from information furnished the Children's Bureau from 41 states, shows the number of children per 1,000 child population who were receiving child welfare services in urban, semi-rural, and rural states in 1954:

States	Total	Public Agencies	Voluntary Agencies
Most urban (11 States)	5.5	2.9	2.6
Semi-rural (15 States) . .	5.9	4.9	1.0
Most rural (15 States) . .	6.9	6.3	0.6

According to the figures the urban states have the lowest rate. The voluntary child welfare agencies in these states have not been able to develop programs large enough to make up for the relatively small public child welfare programs. The table also shows that, in the semi-rural and rural states, the initiation of a public child welfare program was imperative and its expansion is of utmost importance. Mississippi is among the group of the most rural states; but in that state there are 8 counties falling within the definition of "urban," where federal funds can be spent only for "the encouragement and assistance of adequate methods of community organization." In those same 8 counties there are no local child welfare agencies except the county departments of public welfare.

Still Too Little?

The founding fathers of the Social Security Act achieved their purpose. All sections of the country have been alerted to the needs of children and have responded to an amazing extent in trying to meet those needs. The standards of services are high, although, of course, there is still an unevenness both as to quality and to availability. This will continue as long as money and staff are insufficient. The concern of the states about the discrimination against the children in the urban areas is evidence of their broad vision and their desire to reach as many children as possible.

Quite frankly it is frustrating to try to work within a legal framework which has become antiquated in a short twenty years. That it has become so is proof of the rapidity of the growth of the child welfare services program.

Our small corps of child welfare workers has grown to an impressive group of skilled and experienced, but still dedicated, staff. Their voices can be heard both individually and through such organized agencies as the Child Welfare League of America, the U. S. Children's Bureau, the American Public Welfare Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and others. It is good that they are speaking for the freedom to serve children wherever they may be without regard to geographical or to population limitations.

The child and his needs constitute the focal point—let us keep it so. Let us continue to press for a flexibility in the use of federal funds so that the "so little" may be even more effectively used to produce "so much."

University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work



PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION for men and women

*Leading to the Master of Social Work and
to the Doctor of Social Work Degrees*

**A new Work-Study Program (Plan A)
is announced to parallel the regular
2-year program, (Plan B) for the
Master of Social Work**

**The Doctorate program emphasizes
teaching, research and administration**

COMMENTARY ON

"MUST CASEWORKERS DO EVERYTHING?"*

Mary E. Burns

Associate Professor of Social Work
School of Social Work
University of Texas, Austin

In an invited discussion of Miss Swenson's very timely article, the writer takes the position that case aides have a contribution to make quite aside from their possible later interest in training. Further discussion of the subject will appear in the July issue.

THE EXPERIMENT of having case aides handle certain parts of the job traditionally carried by the caseworker is one of many approaches to the problem of the shortage of professionally trained personnel. Miss Swenson's article has set forth a description of the case aide program in her agency.¹ Her thoughtful evaluation of some of the important factors in the successful operation of the program opens many avenues for discussion. Of these, I chose three points which I feel warrant careful consideration:

- 1) the implementation of the case aide program;
- 2) the use of the case aide;
- 3) the stated purposes of the use of case aides in this agency.

Implementation of Case Aide Program

Miss Swenson has identified three factors which she considers basic to the success of the program. Such a program must be carefully planned and participated in by the whole staff; supervision of the case aide must be provided for; and careful selection of case aides is essential.

Looking over the factors involved in carrying out the program, I am immediately struck by the similarity in them and the important considerations made when planning to use volunteers. There are many similarities in programs for volunteers and case aides—level of training, concern for people and interest in "service" are but a few. Perhaps the outstanding differences, granting that

both are well-planned and well-conducted programs, are the continuity and flexibility resultant from the full-time employment of the case aide. There is more time to learn and to do more varieties of tasks. Because there is such similarity it might indeed be profitable for all of us interested in this problem to review past and present methods of training and using volunteers. Adaptation of such information would be required, but our pool of recorded experience is, I believe, greater in the utilization of volunteer "aides" than employed case aides.²

With the volunteer as with the case aide, the planning and total agency participation are vitally important. A busy staff, pressed by the immediate demands of each day, may be reluctant to invest the time in required planning of the policies and procedures that will be necessary for an effective program. However, unless this is done, any experiment in time saving is not given a fair chance and may produce unreliable results. It is thus open to question from the point of view of quantity and quality of result, and is difficult to appraise for usefulness since participation will have been subject to demands of the moment rather than resultant from careful appraisal of how and when the time-saving device can best be used. If the whole agency does not have a sense of the value of using these auxiliary services, they are utilized on a "hit and miss" basis that provides

* Jeanet Swenson, *CHILD WELFARE*, May 1956.

¹ The New England Home for Little Wanderers, Boston, Massachusetts.

² A short, but stimulating report on the use of volunteers can be found in *Family Service Highlights*, December, 1955. "How Much of the Professionals' Job Can the Volunteer Do?", Margaret E. Knowles, Vol. XVI, No. 10.

many more misses than hits. The result is that rather than performing a useful function the volunteer or the case aide feels that her presence is useless, unwanted and even a nuisance. Social work does not have the excess manpower to waste in this way, to say nothing of the devaluing effect upon case aide or volunteer. So in both programs, whole-hearted participation and planning are the first prerequisites for success.

Looking at the second factor, the supervision of the case aide, I would strongly support Miss Swenson's recognition of the importance of supervision and would raise question about the need for orientation. The profession's experience with volunteers has led to the conviction that, after careful selection, a good orientation to the agency's program followed by consistent and sufficient supervision is required to obtain maximum effectiveness. The same should be true of the case aide. Orientation to the agency is valuable for all staff and is essential to sound personnel practice. It need not be a stiff, overly formalized process, and the philosophy, purpose and program of the agency do not need to be understood. The individual should know his place in the whole of the organization, as well as the most essential of the "rules of the game" and why they exist. Even a brief orientation, well thought-out and presented, gives the newcomer a base of security within a field of unknowns; forms the first hand-hold for developing identification with the agency and its service program. Beginning familiarity with the various parts of the agency, why they exist, and awareness of where one fits into the structure and program should be the minimum aim of orientation. Often the orientation, if given largely by the same person who will continue supervision, merges so with the supervisory process that in practice it is hard to say when one stops "orienting" and starts "supervising."

Case Aides Need Supervision

There is no formal preparation for this work and almost every part of it must be learned on the job. "Eavesdropping learning" has a real value and I am sure that all of

us have learned a great deal that way. Staffings and case consultations likewise provide rich sources of increased knowledge. All of these, however, are fragmentary and often not immediately related to the job the learner is trying to master. Supervision not only keeps the lines of responsibility clear, but hopefully can be paced to the learner's achievements and needs in relation to the work to be done. Without this, the fragmentary learning has no central focus about which it can be organized for use. Supervision of the case aide presents many problems. The selective nature of the work to be done requires knowledge of many kinds—knowledge of the community and its resources, the agency and its ways of working, and some degree of organized understanding of human behavior, but does not require that the knowledge be used in a client-worker relationship, directly therapeutic in its purpose. The teaching level and methodology of supervision will be determined by the tasks which the case aide must do, and will vary to some degree with the particular agency depending on the use that it will make of case aides. Further practice and experimentation in supervision of case aides is needed as well as evaluation and recording of the results. As we can experiment and appraise that which we have learned, we will be able to test out more fully the results of using case aides in various settings. Adequate supervision is both a means of insuring a fair test and a way of measuring effectiveness in an experimental program. I would put a strong reinforcement to Miss Swenson's recognition of the need for more supervision of the case aide.

Use of Case Aides

In this experimental experience the uses which the agency has made of case aides are many and varied. However, three general categories of work can be identified:

- 1) desk work, i.e., preparation of summaries, recording of reports, clothing closet organization, and distribution;
- 2) substitute functions where the aide takes over a function usually or formerly handled by a professional person with either a group (kindergarten

teacher) or individual (clinic visits, shopping, haircuts, etc.);

3) handling selected cases:

- a) temporary placement of preschool children;
- b) supervision of babies in foster homes;
- c) foster home studies for normal babies and toddlers.

The selection of work was based upon its effects upon the client and the client-worker relationship. The examples given show one application of this principle. Preschool children, babies, and at times foster parents need and can use the friendly, accepting relationship of the case aide rather than the therapeutically directed relationship of the case-worker. Another use of case aides might add to the casework relationship. True, we wish to do nothing that will interfere with the client-worker relationship, but there are times, particularly with children brought up in a fairly hostile world, where the addition of another relationship, more casual but warm and friendly, can accrue to the total value of the treatment situation. Here a case aide acting as a friendly grown-up taking the child or adolescent to the movies, the zoo, or the park does not detract from the client-worker relationship, but by putting another friendly element into the child's world can add to his capacity. This is an area in which we have been perhaps less daring and experimental than we could be. Carefully thought out, on the basis of our understanding of the child, the assignment of a case aide might be a valuable auxiliary device, as well as a time-saving one for the caseworker.

For those who might be tempted to say that a children's agency offers opportunity to use case aides which other agencies do not, let me hasten to point out two considerations. The use of case aides made here represents a willingness to experiment after careful evaluation of the kinds of situations in which the case aide can function. All agencies will not have the same kinds of situations. Some may have no use at all for such a program. However, many agencies serving adults and the aged often need some of the "substitute" services for their clients. All too often these are not available. Also in most agencies

caseworkers have a large amount of work, that is "processing activity" required to make possible the actual service-giving contacts. This should be evaluated to determine the necessity for using professional time in this way before dismissing the possibility of handling it in another way.

Purpose and Philosophy in Use of Aides

A dual purpose was set forth for this agency's case aide program. It was to be a time-saving device for caseworkers, and a recruitment device for the field of social work. Among criteria for selection of the case aides were the requirements that they must be interested in and considering professional education for social work.

The problem that concerns me is why we have to feel that it is not "professionally acceptable" to create a job of case aide purely as a time-saving device. Why do we have to tie it to the recruitment for the field? Granted that recruitment for the field is a constant and real problem to all agencies, and certainly to schools of social work, it seems unnecessary to justify the employment of case aides on the basis that they provide a good channel for recruitment. If there is justification for a case aide on the basis of the job to be done, then the person who can fill this job best or, fill it well, should be employed for this position, whether or not this person is interested in considering social work education. This is based upon the essential concept that we hire people of competence for the job that is to be filled and not for their future goals.

The basic question here is the willingness of social work to think analytically about the various elements in the job it does, to appraise that part of the job which requires the specific skill of the social worker and to be willing to delegate and to share those parts of the job which can be done as well or perhaps better by others. This is basic both to the philosophy in the selection of the case aides and to their use. If, in Miss Swenson's agency, there is enough valid work to regularly employ three case aides on fully assigned predetermined work loads so that

they do not have enough time for emergencies, the question then becomes are more case aides needed? Does a careful evaluation of the work regularly involved in each case show a rather large quantity of time-consuming effort which does not affect the client directly or the client-worker relationship? If such is the case, in the interest of efficiency and of seeing scarce and expensive skilled casework time used for the treatment of more clients, the case aide program should be expanded. Another alternative of this is to find ways of reducing the amount of this time-consuming work in every way which is possible.

The belief that such a program must be used to recruit for our field may be based on a fear that we will dilute the quality of our services. Each time that there is a personnel shortage we are faced with this problem. Each time we have had to meet it in various ways. But the spread of professional social work continues, and we have been able to hold to the quality of programs. It would be my thesis, then, that we approach realistically the caseworker's job rather than worry about the watering down of programs. Let us recognize that professional time is valuable, and is utilized best in doing those things for which it is uniquely qualified. If other components of the total job can be delegated to someone who may handle them as well or better than the social worker, this should be recognized. We should be willing to look at and analyze our jobs; to "partialize" them in such a way that those components directly affecting the client and the client-worker relationship are known. These remain with the social worker and the others can be handled by someone else.

How then shall we go about this? First, we must have careful analysis of our own work loads, separation of the whole into the various parts of the job, and understanding of the actual relationship again of part to the whole. Most agencies, I am sure, would confirm the results of studies that have been made concerning the division of the caseworker's time. It is reliably estimated, and in

fact confirmed by such studies as we have, that the caseworker spends less than fifty percent of his total time in direct client contact. What actions take the balance of the time? Can they be handled by someone else? Are some other parts of the job perhaps unnecessary at all? In order to work this out each agency needs to think through its own total job and each worker needs to think through his individual job; what he does, where his time goes, how much of it goes where and what reasonably someone else could be expected to perform. Professional self-awareness should prevent the worker from retaining part of the job on the basis of his own need or discarding part on the basis of his own dislikes.

The necessary parts of the job which can be done by someone else then become the material of work for case aides. At such a point we do not raise the question "must the caseworker do everything?". Instead we are more able to come up with the answer "this the caseworker must do, this the case aide can do, this the secretary can do, this the receptionist can handle better than anyone."

Summary

Miss Swenson has pointed up the ways of using case aides along with the important considerations that must go into any planning of such a program. Willingness to experiment, careful planning, and participation by the whole agency are required. Supervision is important to both adequate testing of the experiment and evaluating its results. All agencies may not be able to use case aides, but there should be a willingness to accept the idea; to scrutinize it with an open mind, and to evaluate it against any particular agency's staff needs. We need experience of more agencies and more evaluation of results to provide data for full appraisal of the values and problems of a case aide program.

Further, the issue must be resolved as to whether we are willing to sit down and study the job that we do, how we do it, and the amount of time that it takes. We need to analyze our efforts and determine how much

of what we do can be delegated, how much of it, perhaps, needs no doing at all. We must be willing to face the fact that the social worker cannot do everything but there are some things that the social worker must do. As we more carefully define and isolate those things which the social worker must do, we can also identify those things which the case aide must do. If as a result of our efforts we are able to describe a job which is a case aide's job, let us be willing to accept it as a proper part of our organization and focus on filling these jobs with the most suitable people we can find. We should not feel that we have to justify the filling of the case aide job on any other basis than the fact that it is a valid job to be done in giving good service to our clientele.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

The basic **Two-Year Graduate Curriculum** in social casework or social group work prepares for professional social work practice in all fields. It leads to the degree of Master of Social Work.

The **Advanced Curriculum** offers to qualified persons who hold a Master's degree in social work an advanced, third year of graduate professional education in social casework, group work, welfare organization, supervision, administration, teaching, or research. This curriculum leads to the Advanced Certificate.

The **Doctoral Curriculum** for candidates for the degree of Doctor of Social Work includes, and continues beyond, the Advanced Curriculum in any one of its specializations.

Fellowships are available to students in all curricula.

Address all inquiries to:

(MISS) MARGARET E. BISHOP

Director of Admissions and Placement

School of Social Work

University of Pennsylvania

2410 Pine Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

ON THERAPY*

Sometimes at social work meetings I have longed for an Alice, a blunt and impertinent child who might come uninvited to our Tea Party and ask the crucial questions. Over the years the fantasy of Alice has taken form in my mind and I see her now as a second-year graduate student in a school of social work, earnest, intelligent and unabashed. I really had no intentions of letting her into this paper; she doesn't belong here any more than she belongs in one of our closed meetings, but here she is, unbidden, and determined to be heard.

Enter Alice pursued by an urchin of six with a water pistol. The purple stain on her forehead must not alarm you; it is finger paint and serves to distinguish this tribe of social workers from all others.

"This Tea Party is not open to students!" says The Chairman, scowling at Alice and at the six-year-old who is taking deadly aim at him.

"That's why I came," says Alice pertly.

There is brief commotion while the six-year-old sprays his water pistol into The Chairman's face and bolts out the door at a gallop. In the disorder that follows only Alice retains her composure.

"Who is that child?" says The Chairman, mopping his face.

"That's my case, Dudley McPherson," says Alice. "He has enuresis."

"And what brings you here?"

"I have a question."

"State your question briefly and then kindly permit this Tea Party to continue its urgent business."

"My question is," says Alice, "what am I doing?"

The Tea Party is thrown into fresh disorder.

"How extraordinary! The child doesn't know what she is doing!"

"You haven't answered my question," says Alice.

"My dear young lady," says The Chairman. "Let me ask you a question. What is your function in this agency?"

"I am a caseworker, a student caseworker, that is."

"Then it should be very obvious to you that what you are doing is casework!"

"It isn't obvious to me at all," says Alice. "Dudley has been squirting that water gun since September, and nothing has worked in this case at all."

* Because we fear for our reputation, and in deference to Alice, we are printing this mostly in small type.

"Has there been any movement in the case?" asks a lady in the audience with green finger paint on her forehead.

"Well . . . I have him listed as an active case on my monthly report," says Alice.

"Then there is still hope," says The Chairman heartily.

"What I've been thinking about is this," says Alice. "Isn't there something I might be doing that I'm not doing, something that . . . ?"

"My dear young lady," says The Chairman sharply. "Are you suggesting, or are you about to suggest, that a caseworker can do *Therapy!*!"

Shocked protests from the audience.

"I apologize for my language," says The Chairman, "but this girl is no longer a child and I must speak frankly to her."

"What does that mean, that word?" says Alice.

The Chairman looks embarrassed.

"Do you mean no one has ever told you?"

"Well, I know there are some things a nice caseworker doesn't do, but whenever I ask about it my supervisor says that I will find out when I am older. Sometimes I've been afraid that I might have done it without knowing it. I wish you'd tell me what it means!"

"Therapy," says The Chairman, averting his eyes. "Therapy is . . . Damn it, young lady, are you sure nobody ever told you about this?"

"Is it when two people love each other very much?" says Alice, wanting to be helpful.

"No!"

At this moment a Dormouse who has been sitting inconspicuously at the tea table, reaches into the samovar and pulls out Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. He is applauded wildly for his presence of mind.

"Therapy," he reads. "1. therapeutics. 2. therapeutic nature or power. Therapeutics. 1. serving to cure or heal; curative."

In the pained silence that follows, Alice speaks.

"Why, what's wrong with that? Isn't that just what we want to do, serving to cure or heal?"

"You see!" says a lady in the audience, leaping to her feet. "You tell them about it and the first thing you know they want to do it."

There are cries for order and The Chairman recovers himself. He addresses himself to Alice's question.

"My dear Alice," he says, with commendable patience. "The desire to cure or heal is not abnormal. We now know that these desires arise in all caseworkers and

there is no need to feel ashamed of them. It's like hunger or thirst. But when the desire to cure or heal leads a caseworker to commit Therapy, then she is going too far. If there are caseworkers who are doing Therapy, then they must know in their innermost selves that they shouldn't be doing it, and if caseworkers are not doing it then they must take care to see that whatever it is they are doing should not be done in such a way that it can be called Therapy."

"Suppose whatever it is they are doing results in curing and healing. Isn't that Therapy?" says Alice, addressing the Dormouse.

The Dormouse who has been dozing the liveliest parts of this discussion, is roused by his neighbor who shouts in his ear.

"What's that?" screams the Dormouse. "I never said it. I was only quoting Webster and he's not an authority on casework practice. In casework we mean whatever we say we mean!"

His words are madly applauded.

"What happens to the caseworker who does Therapy?" says Alice, looking The Chairman straight in the eye.

"My dear Alice," says The Chairman. "I can only wonder again that your supervisor has not told you. You see, the caseworker who allows herself to go All the Way, who commits Therapy, will lose something very precious to her, something that can never be replaced. Something decent and fine in her will be lost forever. And when she graduates—if she graduates, this Thing will stand between her and her future happiness."

"You mean," says Alice, "she loses her technical virginity in the field?"

"I wouldn't put it so coarsely," says The Chairman, "and come to think of it young lady, if I were the dean of your school of social work, I'd want to have a talk with you—soon."

SELMA FRAIBERG

Department of Psychiatry, College of Medicine,
Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.

**Have you ordered your copies of
A STUDY OF
ADOPTION PRACTICE
by Michael Schapiro?**

Volume I discusses practices of adoption agencies—Price \$2.25.

Volume II presents the selected scientific papers read at the National Conference on Adoption—Price \$2.25.

When ordered together—Price \$4.00.

HOW TO INTERPRET A FOSTER HOME PROGRAM IN A SMALL COMMUNITY*

Joann F. Davies

Formerly Child Welfare Worker III
Division of Child Welfare
State Department of Social Welfare
Des Moines, Iowa

This article outlines the process of assessing the need for and then developing foster care services in a small community during a three-year period.

It is often stated in social work that one foster home spreads the news of agency service to the next, and thus the framework of care is built to offer services to children living away from their parents. However, the question which follows is, "How do you find the first home?"

The reply to this question is that an agency has to interpret this need for foster homes to its community. This definition of need may serve to reveal the lack in the agency's program, and stimulate development of adequate resources.

In 1952 child-care facilities consisted of a small private children's home, a private sectarian agency which had discontinued most of its foster home program due to lack of staff, a second sectarian agency which was limited to service within its religious group, a Juvenile Court staff attached to the local court which maintained a detention home, a large licensed private nursery offering full or day care to children, and various voluntary service clubs. Throughout the years, Child Welfare Services had been able to offer occasional foster care to a child. When the private agency had to withdraw from the community, the main source of foster homes diminished acutely. Although the Juvenile Court had placed many children, these placements often terminated in adoption of the children by the boarding parents, a disposition which negated the purpose of boarding care and eliminated these homes as resources for the boarding home program.

Scope of Agency Functions

In Iowa Child Welfare Services are county-administered. The local worker's first responsibility is to the county director, the local Board of Social Welfare, and the community in which she works. Consultants from the state staff are available on a regular basis to each county department of social welfare. The Division of Child Welfare outlines seven areas of service in counties covered by local staff. The worker develops services, when the community expresses a need and a readiness. Boarding home care serves the out-of-wedlock child, the unmarried mother, the child who presents an adjustment problem, the neglected and dependent youngster, and the child with a physical or mental handicap.

The Division further assumes responsibility for licensing all the boarding homes. By law, a boarding home caring for three or more unrelated children must be licensed by the Division and by the State Department of Health. Homes caring for less than three children do not require a license, but may request a certificate of approval. The weakness of this law is obvious in that it does not offer protection to all children living away from home. The local caseworker evaluates all known independent boarding homes.

Early Attempts in Placement

The assessment of boarding care needs had no particular beginning. In the daily flow of work, a parent making an occasional request for such care often withdrew before the agency was definitely committed to providing it. The two staff members routinely contacted people who advertised in the local

* This is a report of an experience by the Pottawattamie County (Iowa) Child Welfare Services.

paper their readiness to board children. These studies proved rather discouraging. The agency was limited in its freedom to weed out inadequate homes, as few of them cared for as many as three children. Moreover there was evidence that the primary interest of those who advertised their intent to offer foster care, like those who applied to an agency, stemmed from a financial motive, a wish to acquire a child for adoption, or to have a playmate for an own child.

In 1952, two children were placed by Child Welfare Services in a boarding home which had applied directly to the agency. Almost immediately financial difficulty developed. The organization which agreed to meet costs withdrew its support, stating that it preferred to find its own foster home. The mother of the children felt obligated to the organization, withdrew the children, and returned to a crowded home situation. The boarding parents were angered. Further work with them indicated that they could not share the children with the parents.

Continued follow-up of advertisements, and of voluntary applications to the agency revealed the following:

Number of contacts (telephone, advertisement, office)	39
Number of interviews	20
Number of homes used between 1952 and 1955	6
Number of homes still in use by 1955	2

Recognition of Agency's Growing Needs

Early in 1953, a desperate situation uncovered dramatically the agency's complete inability to help the parent and child who were in need of boarding care.

Late one winter afternoon, a distraught father appeared in the office with his twin sons, aged eleven months. A non-resident, he and his wife had traveled from a neighboring state to our county in search of work. The wife had become seriously ill physically due to pregnancy and seemed to be severely emotionally disturbed too. She had been taken to the local hospital, leaving the father with the babies in a cheap hotel room. Desperately the agency sought to find resources for the children. The father wanted them kept together if possible. He could pay only a small amount of the boarding costs. Only one of the potential homes which we contacted was interested but would take only one of the boys. The unpreparedness of Child Welfare Services was also revealed by its inability to provide for the support of these children in a foster home. The worker

reluctantly advised the father that she could not help him. Through the Public Assistance Division, the family were returned to their legal settlement the following week.

A month later, a second situation arose, this time as a complaint from a boarding home which we had not approved after investigation of their advertisement. The foster mother had undertaken care of a child whom she felt was neglected, and was fearful of continuing without some support from an agency. This was the first indication that the follow-up work on advertisements had had meaning to an independent boarding mother. Having learned a bitter lesson, the agency had developed one foster home—the family who had earlier agreed to take one of the twins. This grew into an excellent resource, for the foster parents were eager to work within the program of the agency.

When casework service was offered to the mother of the baby who was considered neglected, she asked for continued boarding care in one of our homes until she could provide a place for him. The agency foster parents responded eagerly to the child who was pitifully undernourished. This time an organization agreed to meet the costs of this placement.

The agency received a third request for foster care, this time from an extremely disturbed unmarried mother. We were then studying the application of the Wests, a couple who had heard of the agency through friends whom we had contacted through their advertisement. However, Mrs. West was unable to leave her job on short notice, so we were again reduced to hasty assessment of our resources.

With hesitation, although they had been used by the Court several times, we placed this unmarried mother's child with the Browns. Just as we feared, Mrs. Brown, who had previously adopted a child placed on a temporary basis, now attempted to secure the unmarried mother's consent for release of her baby. The mother withdrew frantically before we could locate her.

One important new factor entered this placement: the local Board of Social Welfare had agreed to meet the boarding home costs of a non-resident child on the basis of his emergent needs.

It was now clear that foster care services were being offered in a haphazard way:

1. The agency, uncertain of its resources, moved hastily into planning without thoughtful consideration of a family's suitability for the particular child.
2. The meaning of foster care was unclear to foster parents and the agency was using them without evaluating their needs.
3. Financial planning had no base for determining responsibility.

On the positive side, three factors became evident:

1. some community awareness of the agency's role in the protection of children;
2. a gradual recognition by parents that the agency provided foster care;
3. a realization by prospective foster parents that the agency was a resource from which to secure children on a boarding basis.

This last factor certainly carried unhealthy connotations of which the agency was aware—we could not encourage applicants whose interest in children was based solely on monetary returns. However, by consistent follow-up of requests and thoughtful evaluation of every contact, it was felt we might eventually develop homes in which the child's needs came first.

Second Phase of Home Finding

Strangely enough, it was the child of the disturbed unmarried mother who led the agency into the next stage of recruitment. Because of our concern for him, we followed through on leads as to where he might be. The search ended with finding this child at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Case, a young couple with two children. In the process of casework service on a protective basis, we received a phone call from Mrs. Case's sister. She had heard about the agency and the risks involved in an independent placement, and wondered if she could get a license. "I just happen to have a little boy here whose mother doesn't pay regularly." She wished we could "do something" about the parents' visiting. We moved into the situation in a dual role, evaluating a known boarding home at the request of the foster parents, and offering casework services to the child and his mother. This family experienced great diffi-

culty releasing the child, and needed careful interpretation and support as they prepared him for return to his mother. By this time they requested a license, and in the next two years became one of our most active foster families.

By the end of 1953, we examined our contacts with foster parents and learned that while there were fewer requests for applications, proportionately more personal interviews were held and more homes developed into actual resources:

Number of contacts (telephone, advertisement, office)	21
Number of interviews	11
Number of homes used between 1953 and 1955	6
Number of homes still in use by 1955	5

In 1953, eight children were placed by Child Welfare Services in supervised foster homes, compared with two children the previous year. By the end of 1953, we had had referred three new homes which were developed into adequate resources. It cannot be said just what prompted people to come to the agency. As shown by the 39 requests in 1952, people had been "interested" in boarding children, but this interest could not, by agency standards, be translated into active use of the home in most situations. We began to correlate needs of children with available resources and discovered that resources were non-existent or inadequate. The intensive work with the few foster families, on a day-to-day basis had not yet become known outside of the small sphere of persons who were giving and receiving service within the agency structure.

Developments in Third Year (1954)

Within the first month of the new year, separate placements of four children immediately broadened the base of the agency's foster home program in four areas:

1. The public assistance worker referred three children, requesting help for the natural parents who were receiving ADC.
2. Two newly approved homes and two previously-used homes were put into active use.
3. A doctor referred a child specifically for care.
4. Child Welfare Services established at the request of the Court its own financial records, separate from those of the Juvenile Office, when that agency was meeting boarding costs.

Before this, the Juvenile Office had carried responsibility in this area for both Child Welfare Services and its own cases.

Recognition of Child Welfare Services by other agencies as a resource for foster care developed slowly. The community had accepted group care as adequate. By the end of 1954, six more children were referred and placed at the request of local and out-of-county agencies.

It was possible to give intensive help to the four boarding families used that first month in terms of their relationships with own parents, the agency and the child. We noted development of dependency on the agency, some demanding behavior on the part of the new foster parents which had to be handled as it arose. By the end of the year, nine more homes were used for placement, six of them new to the agency.

The doctor who referred a child for foster care needed help in understanding the role of the boarding mother. His identification with her at the time a child left the home, occasionally handicapped a foster parent in releasing the child. We handled this with him individually, nonetheless it opened another door to agency interpretation. He referred an out-of-wedlock baby directly from the hospital when he learned that an independent placement was being considered. During the year, three children were referred by doctors for foster care. Several of our youngsters needed hospitalization during their placements. This brought the foster parents in contact with hospital personnel and afforded the staff the opportunity to see first-hand the meaning of a child's relationship to substitute parents.

Establishment of separate Child Welfare Services foster care financial records when costs were met by the Juvenile Court indicated further recognition by a vital child-care agency of our role in work with children. This action placed more direct responsibility on Child Welfare Services for advising the Court of its work, and in turn, afforded the judges more opportunities to see the functions of the agency. The feeling of the Court during the early part of this period was that

social agencies "tended to keep children in foster care longer than was necessary." We interpreted to them that we were not wanting long-term placement for the infant or pre-school child, but instead wanted to work out a plan either for return to the parents or release for adoption. Child Welfare Services asked for a conference in the judge's chambers, where together parent, judge and worker planned a temporary program of three months' care in a foster home. The mother and the worker were to move toward a plan either to re-establish a home for the child, or to ask the agency to make another disposition.

Evaluation of Foster Home Resources

A total of twenty-eight families contacted the agency in 1954 regarding foster care. Twenty-three were seen in interviews. Six were developed into boarding homes for children. We discovered that people reached us mainly through two sources, their own families or their neighbors. In our foster home program, there were five related members of one family known to us. Another family experienced deep satisfaction giving care to infants, discussed the child during neighborhood coffee klatches, and this resulted in another home. In still another family group three members became boarding parents. It was interesting to observe the professionalism which characterized each of these boarding parents. At no time did they share unwisely the information about a child with a relative who also had a child from the agency.

In 1954, 36 children were placed, compared to eight the previous year, and two the year before. We began to notice an increasing number of financial resources available to children needing foster care. A veteran's organization, the Public Assistance Division, the Juvenile Court, a private agency, other county boards, and parents offered financial assistance.

The most outstanding resource was the Juvenile Court. Our judges gave a broad interpretation to neglect, so that the Court could provide funds for service to children. This included the "potential" of neglect in those situations where a mother requested

care because she was destitute. In several situations during 1954, the Court's interpretation of the law provided most adequately for severely neglected children who were ineligible for financial aid from other agencies. A typical example:

An unwed mother from another state arrived in town with her three-year-old boy. While she awaited confinement, the Court provided full financial care to her child. When the second child was born and released for adoption, the judge talked with the mother, supporting her in her decision, commending her warmly for the care she gave her first child. This thoughtful (and legal) interpretation of the rights of children assisted Child Welfare Services in several difficult situations, and provided financial and moral support to many children and their parents.

In any rural foster home program the question of legal settlement as affecting who shall bear the cost is important. Iowa still maintains a fairly rigid interpretation of legal settlement, and in Child Welfare Services we found that the needs of the children came first. Of the 36 children cared for in 1954, 14 had settlement out of the county. We found that people basically wanted to help children, and at the same time, wanted to work within the limits of the laws. If there was any possibility that a law could be interpreted to allow service to a child this was done. There did not seem to be a fear of setting a precedent, but instead, a desire to place the emphasis on what was best for the youngster. The most direct form of interpretation was a personal one by the workers, with the support of the agency. At no time was there a refusal for service, although we often had to explore several resources.

Changes in Quality of Foster Care

During 1954, we began to use the same foster homes over again. Soon we found a change in service offered by boarding parents, with a growing understanding of the services an agency offers to parents, a belief in the rightness of a licensing law, and convictions about the use of adoption agencies for children where this is indicated.

In this three-year period, the agency found that a certain cohesiveness between agency

and foster parents can best be established through effective, thoughtful and prompt service to boarding families. With agency supervision foster parents seem to develop inner resources, often unnoticed at intake. Their need for acceptance and approval cannot be underestimated. During the early months of work with a new family, needs could not always be met between 8 AM and 5 PM. With each new set of parents, we saw somewhat demanding requests for financial reimbursement above the regular boarding rate, a testing of the agency's assurance that it was responsible throughout the placement, an emotional conflict at the time the first child was removed, and a need to verify the agency's interest in them as people.

Motive may not always be clear in foster care, and often it was not until a family accepted a child that we began to know their investment. Any agency which is undertaking the development of a foster care program might well prepare itself to meet an onslaught of dependency needs of foster parents, as well of natural parents and the children in placement.

Interpretation to Other Agencies

The purpose of foster care was not always clear to the community. Some agencies, just as prospective foster families, viewed this resource as a short-cut to adoption. Because Child Welfare Services was not authorized by law, and because of basic principles involved in the adoption of children, the agency could not and would not sanction adoption of children by their foster families. This interpretation needed to be made carefully to the Juvenile Court, which was authorized to agree to such placements, and their acceptance of our role was excellent. We had to interpret the responsibility for providing adequate clothing and medical care for children in boarding homes. The small children's institution raised considerable question about our use of foster homes, feeling that their organization offered more adequate care to children. As each situation arose, we interpreted the needs of children,

and several mothers of infants were referred to us by the institution, which could not accept them. The large private nursery which had served many children prior to the foster home program continued to offer excellent emergency and short-term care to youngsters. It expressed some feeling about the inroads our agency made into its program, but accepted the reality of county foster care as a more economical resource than it could offer.

Despite the almost trebled increase in numbers of placement, the agency was aware that it was prepared to help only the pre-school child and the infant. Resources needed to be developed for the school-aged child. Casework help should be given to natural parents at the time of placement and throughout the period of care. More thorough knowledge of the children prior to placement would increase our helpfulness to them. Foster parents can use more help to gain broader understanding of the meaning of placement to the child and parents. Periodic evaluation of

foster homes will reduce the numbers of unsuccessful placements. Lastly, the agency needs to evaluate more clearly the continuing need of the community for foster homes, and thus avoid an inadequate placement because of lack of resources.

Summary

During the first year, the demand for foster homes could not be met; some correlation between demand and resource occurred in the second year; by the third year, more parents were requesting foster care and more applicants' homes were becoming approved. A stable financial base was provided due to the wholehearted interest of the community in the program. Foster parents began to make use of casework services and to establish loyalties to the agency. By the end of the year, these gains still needed to be strengthened and consolidated by continued active service of the casework staff to the entire community.

COMMENTARY ON "ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION OF CHILD WELFARE" *

Helen C. Hubbell

Director
Bureau of Children's Services
State Department of Public Welfare
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

In responding to Mr. Class' article, the author pleads for flexibility in organization in order to take into account the special knowledge and skill required in services for children.†

MR. CLASS presents in forthright fashion his point of view on a problem which has "plagued both houses" for years, namely, should public assistance and child welfare be combined in a single administrative structure. He follows his statement that such a

* Norris E. Class, *CHILD WELFARE*, May 1956.

† The author states her "comments will reflect the thinking of a professional social worker identified with the child welfare field and not necessarily my agency's point of view."

grouping is unsound with his concept of the form of organization most suitable for child welfare and gives the specifics of the structure and the difficulties involved.

It is difficult for me to gauge the impact of Mr. Class' statement on states which have the "union" of public assistance and child welfare. For a state with separate administration for each of the two programs it clarifies a confused picture.

Separate Administration Appraised

The public assistance program in our state, and perhaps in others, is a "miracle" of the depression, with its statewide coverage, uniformity of procedures, non-dependence on local funds, expression in the law of concern for people, sizable staff under civil service and millions of state and federal dollars. In 1937 Pennsylvania found itself equipped to provide an economic floor for its economically deprived citizens almost overnight. In contrast, child welfare was left a local responsibility dependent on local funds, with child welfare services federal funds supplementing in certain counties and under certain conditions. Public assistance has come from the top down—a canopy covering the state; child welfare has had to build from the bottom up, county-by-county, service-by-service, and staff member-by-staff member. If there are other states with this contrast, their child welfare directors may have looked wistfully, as we have, at public assistance strengths—their orderly procedures, defined policies, smoothly working machinery and availability of money. We have wondered at times if a combination with public assistance might infuse these strengths into child welfare without the loss of child welfare's treasured possession, defined in broad terms by Mr. Class as the "social service component." We have asked ourselves whether a quantitative agency could combine with a qualitative one, thus infusing quality into public assistance and quantity into child welfare, to the advantage of the beneficiaries in both programs. Aside from the discussion of these problems by those working in both programs, there have been deliberations and studies by statewide citizens' groups and governmental bodies, the latter primarily interested in efficient administration with resulting economies. The pendulum of thinking has swung back and forth, with recent developments directed toward enlarging and strengthening child welfare programs at the state level and in local communities, with continuing separate administration.

A significant element in the period of

vacillation has been child welfare workers' distrust of the aid-to-dependent-children program because of its lack of social services in situations where these services were acutely needed and not forthcoming from public assistance. One reason for this distrust may have been child welfare workers' misunderstanding of, or resistance to the public assistance concepts of the "right to assistance," "the unrestricted grants" provision and the "income maintenance" philosophy. The neat and tight policies and procedures implementing these concepts have seemed contrary to the implicit purposes of both federal and state public assistance laws. These concepts seemed to emphasize funds rather than people and to protect dollars rather than children. This feeling on the part of child welfare workers has been a barrier between ourselves and public assistance. At times we have sufficiently penetrated this barrier to discuss the problem in friendly fashion, to work on referral procedures for our local agencies and to explore informally the advantages and disadvantages of having both programs in one agency.

Child Welfare Scope Widening

During this period there have been developments in child welfare which seem to support Mr. Class' thesis of separation. One of these is broadening the scope of child welfare to include children with labels beyond the traditional ones of dependent, neglect and delinquent. As we move from labels to children's needs, we include the mentally retarded who should stay in the community, the emotionally disturbed, those needing supervised group facilities and temporary shelter. The range of functions which Mr. Class lists for a state child welfare department suggests the scope of services which should be available to all children in all communities. Thus, child welfare is becoming quantitative with a need for scope and coverage, and for millions of dollars. As this happens child welfare should build strengths of its own, comparable to and parallel with pub-

lic assistance, thus justifying its separateness. The problem for child welfare will be to keep those qualitative strengths which are rooted in its right and obligation to provide social services directly or indirectly as justification for its very being. As child welfare administrative structures develop and enlarge, costs will increase, thus opening the door for the kinds of public scrutiny and attack which have been directed at public assistance from time to time.

Goals and the Problems Encountered

If the goal in child welfare is a range of services for all children in all communities, child welfare workers will have to see its relationship to the public assistance concepts which we have resisted. If the right to assistance means income maintenance for a citizen without the impedimenta of social services which he may or may not want or need, he is free (as are all other citizens, whatever the source of income), to use all available community resources. This has always been true in principle but the resources in many communities have been inadequate or lacking. If the communities, with the help and support of a strong state department of child welfare, provide a range of services, the aid to dependent children program could well remain in public assistance. However, this will place on child welfare workers the responsibility for developing more available services and for ceasing to deplore the lack of the social service component in public assistance. This is particularly so with the current emphasis, in child welfare, on services to parents on behalf of children in their own homes. For years this was a no-man's land in child welfare except for being included in a broad definition of protective services. Too often, however, especially in public agencies, protective service has been limited to "complaint" situations due to limitations in definitions of the agency's functions, to pressures of other case loads and to inadequate financing. As this service emerges with conviction and responsibility in the programs of child-caring agencies, communities will be equipped

with social services for the aid to dependent children program.

On the other hand, there are states with combined programs where the child welfare philosophy of concern for the individual, and its obligation to provide services with casework skills, have permeated the total agency, providing a climate for professional social services. A separation of child welfare in such situations might deprive large numbers of children of the social service component before it is available in all communities under the auspices of child welfare. The core of the problem seems to be whether the basic philosophy in public assistance can encompass responsibility for casework services. If the answer is in the negative, we in child welfare can support Mr. Class' emphasis on the rightness of a separate department of child welfare with a wide range of services, leaving the aid to dependent children program with public assistance. This will involve our accepting responsibility for protecting the quality of child welfare service as it takes on quantitative aspects.

The problem of where, how and to what degree to include psychiatric services in child welfare is confronting our state at the present time. Mr. Class, in separating the "functions of general psychiatry" from the implementation of child care programs with psychiatric services, is helpful if we can define general psychiatric service. Certainly, residential treatment facilities with their psychiatric orientation come within the child welfare field as does the development of more community facilities for mentally retarded children. The "union" of mental health in the area of child psychiatry with child welfare may be more legitimate than the union of public assistance and child welfare in these days when child-caring agencies and institutions are saying: "Our children are so different—so much more troubled and presenting so many problems that are new to us."

The Question of State Boards

In principle, I agree with Mr. Class that a policy-making state child welfare board would provide the strengths he enumerates.

pendent. However in many states where the traditional pattern of department heads as members of the governor's cabinet still prevails, such a board would be an anomaly. In Pennsylvania there is a state board of public assistance and a secretary of public assistance who is a member of the governor's cabinet. In such a situation the executive officer can serve two masters, with one (the governor) having the power to override or nullify the board's recommended policies. A strong, representative advisory committee or board might provide the desirable strengths and represent the reality of the governor being the final authority in state government.

If the welfare board of child welfare taking responsibility for direct operations, except for those which are beyond the capacity of the community, even with financial help from the state. "The traditional pattern of state supervision with local administration" becomes more effective and encompassable with regional offices and I would yield to the judgment of states like New York as to whether regional offices should provide direct services. It is true that child welfare facilities, such as detention homes and residential treatment centers, lend themselves especially to regional administration under state auspices. Experience with these facilities might determine in what directions and to what degree state administration should replace local. It would be important for such planning to be a joint undertaking of the state government with the state organizations for community planning and fund-raising.

Difficulties of Reorganization

Mr. Class' statement "the implementation of the process to bring about the reorganization of social services for children will not be easy" is an understatement. It will be terrific! It will need first, an accepted philosophy that services to children are important enough to justify a department created by legislation which will provide appropriation of millions of state dollars. This philosophy will have to permeate the state in order to secure an edict

of the people for such legislation. We have the dramatic aspects of juvenile delinquency to help, but these do not compare with the impact on the public of the widespread tragedies of the depression. We also have the slogan "peace and prosperity" as a favorable climate for highlighting our obligation to our child population. This may be the time for providing a sounding-board of public opinion, for it will be the citizens who will determine the outcome, not government alone. It is certainly true that public administrators will produce unpredictable reactions for the reasons Mr. Class gives, and undeniably their points of view, expressed individually and collectively, will be a determining factor in securing support for state departments of child welfare.

The resistance of child welfare workers has many facets. Those who enjoy security of conscience and professional integrity in a combined agency would be justified in resisting and questioning the change. Those who have the problem of trying to provide services for children within a structure controlled by "business" administration would still find change most difficult but would move with it, provided they could see a firm structure to carry the professional services which they are prepared in motivation and skill to give. The existing child welfare structure in our state is held together by fragmentary law implemented by rules and regulations, lacks civil service coverage and does not have earmarked funds in the total agency's budget. Until recently it had taken the discipline of the federal requirements for child welfare services funds to give form and substance to our child welfare program.

If the strength and security which child welfare has in public assistance can be duplicated in a state child welfare department in which there will be the qualitative plus, the climate for sensitivity and feeling expressed in professional skills, I believe child welfare workers will move with the children under a new and different canopy of child care services. That which is right for children will be the measure of rightness for child welfare workers.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISION

Frances D. Bellanca

Adoption Supervisor
New York Suburban Office
New York State Department of
Social Welfare, NYC

How a State Department of Social Welfare helps local agencies to develop through administrative supervision is the subject of this paper—the second of three articles on administrative supervision vs. consultation. Only part of the content covered in supervision is described in this paper.*

As Adoption Supervisor my function is a dual one, that of administrative supervision and intensive training. The administrative-supervisory responsibility is prescribed by the Social Welfare Law. Agencies are selected for this supervision and intensive training on the basis of their need for this help, recognized by both the Department and the agency.

Selection of the Local Agency

In the selection of an agency many factors are taken into account, such as: the community setting, the coordination of the agency's services with those of other community agencies; the agency's administrative structure and organization; general standards and practices.

The availability and quality of casework services to all three parties involved in adoption—natural parents, particularly unmarried mothers, children and adoptive parents; the number of children in foster care and duration of care; the volume and movement of inquiries and applications from couples interested in adopting a child—all these serve as a basis for determining the agency's need for supervision and training by the Department.

The Department gains its understanding of these facts through periodic surveys, case reading, studies, statistical reports, regular supervisory visits and other media open to a

state department in carrying out administrative supervision.

When it is first considered, an agency may or may not be aware of its own needs. If it is not, the first step is to help the agency to recognize its situation so that it can accept its need for help. Selection of an agency means commitment on its part as well as on the part of the state department.

When the agency whose experience I am describing¹ was identified as requiring adoption service, the local commissioner was expressing concern regarding a turnover of staff. He was requesting a training consultant for his agency or a training program in which various local child welfare supervisors could participate. Neither request could be met. Instead the Department proposed its plan for adoption services. Supporting the consideration of this particular agency were the facts that the administrative structure was sound; the commissioner a capable administrator, constantly making efforts to improve the agency; and the child welfare supervisor a person of ability, vision and high aims for service responsive to stimulation and guidance.

Defining Our Common Goals

At a conference attended by the Department's Area Director, the local commissioner and the agency child welfare supervisor, we discussed the problems which the agency was facing—the need for training, the limited staff and the high case loads. How could specialized supervision and training succeed

* The first article, "Administrative Supervision vs. Consultation," was written by Edith S. Baxter and appeared in the May 1956 issue of CHILD WELFARE. The third, to appear in the July 1956 issue of CHILD WELFARE, will be written by Elma Kullman of Ulster County, New York.

¹ This is the Ulster County Department of Public Welfare, in Kingston, New York.

when the staff needed assistance in regard to all of the child welfare services? On the face of it, it might seem that this program might require more from the agency than it could give at this time.

We examined specifically the large number of children in boarding care, children whose situations demanded intensive study and analysis to determine whether continued boarding care was right for them. To some of these children, adoption could give the security of permanence they so desperately needed. On this we all agreed. There was a further recognition that to achieve adoption for these children the caseworkers needed to develop skills to help parents with their own problems, particularly unmarried mothers so that they could make appropriate decisions. The child welfare supervisor brought out her concern that even if parents were helped and children released for adoption, there were no available adoption homes. Though during the previous summer the agency had concentrated homefinding services in one caseworker, she also carried a large case load of children so that her time for homefinding was extremely limited. The agency also expressed their real need for assistance in regard to the process of home studies.

This discussion clarified the fact that consideration of adoption for a child reached into many aspects of child welfare. Training in adoption services could therefore have basic values for the caseworkers, and adoption services could act as a lever to raise the standards of all child welfare services.

Having defined our common goals, our next conference served to explore what was involved for each in this adoption program. It was clearly understood that the county agency would retain its responsibility for decisions in adoption placement. My relationship with the commissioner would be in regard to broad administrative aspects. With respect to practice I would be working directly with the supervisor—the key local agency person in this program, and with the staff through conferences and group sessions.

For the first year at least I would be in the agency three consecutive days every other

week, reading cases the first few weeks while the local supervisor began to adjust her work in preparation. We set up the first date to give the caseworkers time to bring their dictation up-to-date.

The work plan included a review of cases of children under age seven, cases of all unmarried mothers, some boarding home records, active adoption inquiries and applications, current adoption home studies and records of approved adoption homes. The supervisor and I would have conferences in relation to findings, evaluations, procedures and policies. In relation to case planning, I would have conferences together with both the supervisor and the caseworker. We would set up the adoption exchange procedure and begin our training sessions after an initial period of study of the cases and after case conferences. An agency adoption manual was our ultimate plan.

In response to my recognition that it was natural to have positive and negative reactions to this kind of project, the supervisor commented that though she welcomed State supervision, there is always a feeling of anxiety engendered by it. We were sensitive to the fact that anxiety is promoted not only by State supervision but by the self-examination involved. With this awareness we moved on.

First Block of Work

Services to Parents and Children

According to plan the supervisor had grouped the children under age seven as follows:

1. children in adoptive homes awaiting legal adoption;
2. children for whom adoptive placement was being planned;
3. children who do not have a sustaining relationship with their parents and for whom adoption might be considered;
4. children who have a sustaining relationship with their parents and for whom adoption should not be considered.

Reading the records, I studied the reason for placement, the meaning of placement to parents and children, the intended length of care, preparation of parents and children for separation and the ultimate goals defined at intake. I was particularly concerned about

services to unmarried mothers, the method and source of referrals, the availability and use of community resources, such as maternity homes, other social agencies, psychiatric clinics and courts.

I examined the quality of service given to the parents after the boarding home placement of the child—in relation to their own problems and in relation to making decisions about their children. I observed the significance of emotional disturbances of the children and how these disturbances might relate to separation and conflicts regarding their identities.

In the cases of children for whom adoption had been planned I secured such facts as the age of the child at the time of surrender, age at time of adoptive placement and reasons for delay in the surrender or placement. I took note of concepts of "adoptability," the availability and use of consultants—medical, psychological and psychiatric. I examined the processes involved in selection of an adoptive home, adoptive placement, supervision after adoptive placement and legal adoption.

The records gave me a picture of the family situations and an understanding of the agency's philosophy and practice, its administrative functioning and community relationships, the strengths and weaknesses.

In conference the supervisor and I reviewed the findings and their significance. Our analysis of the cases of children awaiting legal adoption showed that all of them were out-of-wedlock. In all of the cases but one, the mothers had been able to decide on surrender without too much conflict. Adoptive placement had been delayed in all cases except one because no homes suitable for these children were available. The children had shown normal development.

In the cases of children for whom adoption was still in the planning stage, all but one had been born out-of-wedlock. The parents had had considerable difficulty in arriving at a decision of surrender. Some legal complications still needed to be worked out. Adoptive placement also was being delayed as potential adoptive homes were awaiting study.

Studying the Children's Needs

The group which concerned us most were those children who did not have a sustaining relationship with their parents and, therefore, might be considered for adoption. Three-fourths of the children were born out-of-wedlock. In many instances, the parents showed considerable indecision, guilt and anxiety but although they could not give of themselves in a parental relationship, their guilt stood in the way of their releasing the children for adoption. Some parents clung to a determination to keep the children, visited them sporadically, but were incapable of re-establishing a home. Some parents were mentally deficient or unstable; some were institutionalized; it was difficult legally to secure releases of their children. There were also other legal problems such as securing consent to adoption from husbands who were not the fathers or establishing abandonment legally.

Among this latter group of children were some for whom adoption might be considered but for whom it might be questioned as well. Some of these children had relatives who sustained them somewhat and who to some extent compensated for the deprivation of parental affection. Other children had been in boarding care for a long time and had set down roots in the foster family. A small number of children showed serious problems in development or came from families with extremely serious mental or physical disabilities.

As a visual aid in discussing plans with the caseworkers, we set up charts on the cases under the following headings:

Children in Adoptive Homes:

Name; Race; Religion; Birth Status; Birth Date; Date Taken into Care; Date of Surrender; Date of Psychological Study; General Health and Development; Date of Adoption Placement; Age at Time of Adoption Placement; Reasons for Delay in Surrender or Adoption Placement.

Children for Whom Adoption Was Being Planned and Children for Whom Adoption Might Be Considered:

Name; Religion; Race; Birth Status; Birth Date; Date Taken into Care; Date of Surrender; Date of Psychological Study; General Health and Development; Major Factors in Case Situation; Plan.

To these charts were added the names of children later accepted into care. Periodically we added entries on the charts to show progressive steps in planning and final plan achieved. This gave a graphic picture of movement.

Help to the Parents

Subsequent developments showed what happened with improved services in cases where the agency considered the possibility of adoption. For some parents, discussion regarding adoption brought home a realization of what the children meant to them and, with the support and understanding of the caseworker, they could use help and develop more positive relationships with their children. Other parents were freed to unburden their feelings of guilt so that they could look upon surrender as an act of caring—as a positive responsible way of meeting the needs of their children. In other instances the parents were so disturbed, so deprived themselves and had problems of such long duration that they could not at the time move in any direction. The seriousness of these cases required deep sensitivity, skill and understanding to help them try to resolve their problems. In some instances the agency had to be ready to use legal resources to establish parental abandonment.

Through more adequate services to the parents and with the emphasis on earlier adoption and redefinition of "adoptability," more children were becoming available for adoption. It was now that we set up our adoption exchange procedure since no suitable adoptive homes were ready for these children.

Now our work pointed more and more toward the advisability of specialization of staff in adoption. A caseworker was designated by the supervisor to carry the cases of all unmarried mothers and their children plus the cases of married parents and children where adoption was one possible plan. At the same time the homefinder's responsibility was redefined as limited to homefinding.

It was understood that the supervisor

would always participate in my conferences with the caseworkers, as it was she who had the responsibility of implementing the services, and it was she who would inspire and sustain development of the caseworkers.

All the workers were carrying very high case loads—a matter of real concern to everyone. This situation we hoped would be alleviated soon since the commissioner had requested his appropriating body to approve an additional caseworker.

Second Block of Work

Training Sessions

We began our sessions with the subject of adoption homefinding as the supervisor had requested this. We planned later to discuss services to the natural parents, particularly the unmarried mother, and services to the child. In these sessions, as in individual conferences, I always related the discussion to basic principles. Through these group meetings in which the entire staff participated, even those who were not directly a part of the adoption program became identified with it.

Our approach to the problems in homefinding was the same as that used in the study of the children. I read the records of adoptive homes, reviewed all active inquiries and applications and then conferred with the supervisor and homefinder. Our study showed us why problems existed. It was because the administrative procedures needed to be defined and clarified, and the staff needed help with the homefinding process. Both of these factors plus the limited time available for homefinding had resulted in little or no movement in processing applications or studies.

We now set up administrative procedures which included an adoption register of inquiries, applications and studies, control cards, a record filing system and statistical methods. Some forms which had been used in the process of study were eliminated and others revised. We began to examine and sift out inquiries and applications which had been pending for some time.

Our greater concern was in relation to the principles which guided the agency's service to the adoptive applicants. Whereas in a home study the agency had stressed securing of facts regarding the applicants, we also now gave careful consideration to the criteria of capacity for adoptive parenthood such as: the reason for childlessness and attitude toward it, attitude toward illegitimacy, ability to accept difference, emotional maturity, early experiences and quality of family life, and finally their motives in seeking a child by adoption. Through helping the supervisor and homefinder evaluate the process, we developed an outline of study of adoptive homes which would be based on a dynamic relationship between the agency and the adoptive applicants. We reexamined the essentials in selecting a particular home for a particular child, the purpose of supervision of the adoptive home and the final step of legalization of adoption. In the light of an understanding of what the child needs of his adoptive parents, we now began to see the adoption service as a whole.

Now the staff is looking forward to the preparation of a manual which will represent the agency's new philosophy, policies and practice.

Conclusion

In discussing this process of administrative supervision, it is not easy to divide it into steps or separate it into parts. There are however some aspects which characterize each phase of this particular developing relationship.

Experience has shown that an agency which is aware of its needs and is asking for help has taken the first positive step towards growth. This recognition plus an understanding of the pressures under which the agency is working are essential in planning a new project. There will probably always be problems such as staffing pressures, financial limitations, etc. The challenge is how to succeed in spite of all these distracting forces, for if we dream of waiting until a situation is perfect, the dream remains only a dream. So

we must start at the point where the agency is and take into consideration the unique characteristics which will affect progress.

In entering into this kind of commitment the local agency needs to know as much as possible what will be involved in the course ahead. This is essential so that the specialized service will not throw the rest of the agency's activities out of balance and so that there can be adequate preparation. What are the goals, the common aims, the estimate of work in terms of time and pressures? Is the function of the Adoption Supervisor so defined that the agency sees clearly the lines of relationship to the various representatives of the State? For while the Adoption Supervisor is working with the agency, other field representatives are active in relation to other services.

The conflicts involved in change must be recognized and only by such recognition can we achieve a positive climate for learning and growth.

Once the beginning is established the continuing relationship will encourage and support the breaking up of old patterns and the taking on of new ones. As the Adoption Supervisor examines past performances in an agency, the aim is not to criticize or to condemn but rather to effect change for the improvement of services. The agency should be helped to participate in the analysis of its own strengths and weaknesses and can do this with some sense of comfort inspired by the sincerity and unbiased motivation of the Adoption Supervisor.

Since everything cannot be accomplished at once, there must be selection of what is most important. If an Adoption Supervisor is driven by her own impulse, the agency may be overwhelmed. We recognize that agencies are steeped in tradition and may only cautiously expose themselves and their clients to change.

The final achievement of this administrative process is the agency's development of maximum self-direction. This is the way of all growing and maturing relationships—the movement toward free and responsible action.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

MAY HEARINGS were held on two bills affecting children directly. Joseph H. Reid sent written testimony on one, S. 3570, introduced by Senator Langer. It is concerned with the program for providing homes by adoption for alien orphan children who do not have families of their own. In taking the position that the emergency legislation admitting such children should become permanent law, Mr. Reid pointed out that the United States, a country made up of people of various national origins, races and creeds, has much to contribute in providing suitable adoption homes for these alien orphans and that, in turn, these children have much to contribute to Americans who want to complete their families by adoption. Mr. Reid went on to say further that these children should be offered the same measure of protection and individualized care which is given to American children placed for adoption and the families that receive them. He pointed out that Section V of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and the Regulations implementing it substantially provide such safeguards. However, unless action is taken in this session of Congress, the Orphans Program under the Refugee Relief Act will terminate on December 31, 1956 and deprive needy orphans abroad of their much-needed opportunity of permanent homes with American families.

Mr. Reid observed that the need of children abroad is so great that the Refugee Relief Act should be amended to increase the number of visas authorized in Section V from 4,000 to 9,000. Furthermore he urged that the age limit of eligible orphans be raised from ten to fourteen years; that the validity of each visa issued to an orphan adopted abroad be extended until such time as his parents, temporarily residing abroad, return to the United States. Because of the League's deep concern about proxy adoptions, Mr. Reid urged that the request for the issuance of an immigration visa should be denied in the cases of children whose adoption was carried out by proxy in a foreign court. The

term proxy adoption is used to describe the adoption of a child abroad by parents residing in the United States who are represented in a foreign court by a proxy. The validity of proxy adoption has been questioned in the United States court. We consider proxy adoption an unsound practice because it opens the door to possibilities of unscrupulous persons charging large sums of money for location and placement of adoptable children as well as encouraging well-meaning, but misguided individuals to indulge in placement operations which allow the creation of a legal child-parent relationship between a child and a family who have never seen each other. This practice has no justification since Section V of the Refugee Relief Act provides for immigration and adoption of foreign children with the protection of preplacement social investigation and assurance of a standby responsibility carried by a social agency until legal adoption is completed. League member agencies have, in fact, participated actively in this capacity.

The second bill on which hearings were held was S. 3021. One of the League's board members presented the testimony. On this we will report later.

BOOK NOTES

The Nursery School and Child Care Center.
A Parents' and Teachers' Guide, by Clark E. Moustakas and Minnie Perrin Berson. Whiteside, Inc. and William Borrow and Company, New York, 1955. 222 pp. \$3.50.

Nursery schools and child care centers have developed distinctively under a wide variety of auspices and have been established for many purposes. In this book, the authors, both staff members of the Merrill Palmer School, Detroit, describe and evaluate all types of nursery schools and child care centers currently operating in this country. The material has been prepared as a guide, and, as such, should and will be read by many parents and professional workers who work with young children. The guiding value of this writing should lead to a richer philosophy of child education and care. Clearly, the

authors have made a significant contribution in a field which has needed clarification. As a single resource this book is a valuable tool.

At the onset Dr. Moustakas and Mrs. Berson include in their definition of a nursery school all daytime group programs for young children. They

"see the nursery school as an educational center that furthers the development of the young child and the successful functioning of a group of young children. Its goal is to maintain a balance between spontaneous behavior and conformity to society's standards. It is concerned with the feelings and attitudes of young children and their developmental skills. It seeks to help children realize their potential and at the same time aids them to accept the limits of life in a democratic society."

The nursery should be concerned with the total development of the child.

Source material for the descriptions is data received and evaluated from 835 nursery schools and child care centers including the cooperative nursery school, the laboratory school, nursery schools for exceptional children, community nursery schools, private child care centers, child care centers in public schools, and community child care centers. Clearly and concisely, with a minimum of specialized terminology, they critically examine the history, philosophy, organization, structure, and function of each.

The differences and similarities of the nursery programs come into clear focus as the authors selectively include relevant material which establishes a unique identity for each in terms of basic purpose, function, and structure. While there is acceptance of the

varied philosophies and purposes, the authors explicitly and skillfully recognize both the limitations and potentialities of a particular type of program. Their evaluations reflect their own understanding of sound education and care for young children. This should enable the reader to have an enlightened understanding of the existing facilities and increased perception of criteria from which to develop new services.

Comparable factual data presented about each type of program serves as an excellent source for perceiving the many skills involved in planning and conducting a nursery educational program. The use of tables has successfully been employed to show the location of centers studied, the length of operation, the qualifications of staff, fees, and length of sessions. Bibliographies pertaining to each type of program are well chosen. The concluding chapter reviews the several state laws governing the operation of nurseries, noting their individual strengths and weaknesses. The authors emphasize the need for comprehensive practicable legislation in this area of child welfare services.

The real merit of this book stems from Dr. Moustakas' and Mrs. Berson's presenting with conviction their own philosophies and objectives of a vital dynamic preschool educational service for children and families.

MARY V. MINNIE

Supervisor, Day Care, Wisconsin Division for Children and Youth, Madison

CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL OPENINGS

Classified personnel advertisements are inserted at the rate of 10 cents per word; boxed ads at \$6.50 per inch; minimum insertion, \$2.50. Deadline for acceptance or cancellation is eighth of month prior to month of publication. Ads listing box numbers or otherwise not identifying the agency are accepted only when accompanied by statement that person presently holding the job knows that the ad is being placed.

CASEWORKER III in parent-child guidance service which is a service to families with troubled boys between the ages of 6-18; psychiatric and psychological consultation available. Requirements: Master's degree social work school plus five years' experience following graduation; experience in counseling with children and parents preferred. Man. Salary \$4572-\$5832, five-step plan. Social Security and retirement, health insurance paid by agency. Milton L. Goldberg, Executive Director, Jewish Big Brothers Association, Room 366, 590 N. Vermont Ave., Los Angeles 4, Calif.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES WORKERS needed for fast-growing southern California county in developing adoptions or child welfare work. Excellent supervision. Starting salary \$397; step increases to \$483. Salaries under review for possible increase July 1. Benefits. Must have one year in graduate social work school. Write County Civil Service Office, 236 Third St., San Bernardino, Calif.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA: Openings for family and child welfare caseworkers (2). New salary scales effective March, 1956: Social Worker Grade I to \$4908, Social Worker Grade II to \$5424, Social Worker Grade III to \$6132. For further information and description of grade qualifications write: Executive Director, Catholic Social Service of San Francisco, 1825 Mission Street, San Francisco 3, Calif.